

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NICHOLLE VANNUCCI, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COUNTY OF SONOMA, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-01955-VC


**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART MOTION TO  
CLARIFY THE STIPULATED  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 134

Following the hearing, the Court has concluded that the plaintiffs' motion contains only one proper request for clarification of the injunction. This relates to whether a direction to relocate constitutes an "enforcement action" as the injunction defines that term. The plaintiffs appear to argue that a "direction to relocate" is always an enforcement action, while the defendants appear to argue that it is never an enforcement action. Neither of these is a reasonable interpretation of the injunction. Rather, a direction to relocate rises to the level of an enforcement action when a reasonable person would understand that a failure to promptly comply would result in a consequence described in Section 2(c)(i). This is clear from the language of the injunction itself, which means that it's unnecessary to examine the history of the parties' negotiations (although that negotiation history is consistent with this interpretation of the language). This order terminates Docket No. 134.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 4, 2020

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge